

Amendment After Final Rejection  
Serial No. 10/019,297  
Attorney Docket No. 011700

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending. Applicants propose amendment of claims 1 and 20-27. Claims 3 and 17-22 stand withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected species.

Entry of the amendments after final rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 23-27 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner notes that “said water quality purification material” in claim 23 lacks antecedent basis. Applicants believe that the proposed amended claims are in full compliance with §112.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24 and 26 were again rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Burchard et al. At the top of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has stated that the limitation “without penetrating the water purification cartridge” has been broadly interpreted “as the flow of water which does not have to pass through the purifying material of the cartridge.”

On pages 14 and 15 of the Office Action, it is noted that the Examiner comments on applicants’ prior arguments. The Examiner states that it is clear from the specification that the applicants did not intend the limitation to preclude the raw water flowing centrally of the cartridge, highlighting the paragraph at the top of page 29. The Examiner also highlights claim 3 (which is now withdrawn) as support for his position that the limitation can be interpreted properly to mean that the raw water flow path does not penetrate the filtration material.

Amendment After Final Rejection  
Serial No. 10/019,297  
Attorney Docket No. 011700

Applicants propose amendment of claim 1-10 encompass both embodiments noted by the Examiner for clarity. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to include the following clause:

wherein when said water purification flow path penetrates from the outer circumference to the inner circumference, the raw water flow path flows at the outer circumference, and when said water purification flow path penetrates from the inner circumference to the outer circumference, the raw water flow path flows at the inner circumference.

The amended claims distinguish over Burchard et al. since the raw water flow path of Burchard et al. is always at the inner circumference and the water purification flow path only penetrates from the outer circumference to the inner circumference.

The Examiner states at page 4 that the term “incorporated” has been defined by the Examiner to convey the same meaning that “comprises” does. However, the claims had been previously amended to delete the term “incorporated.”

Claims 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al. in view of Corder; claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al in view of Corder and Magnenat et al.; claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al. in view of Nguyen et al.; claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al. in view of Magnenat et al.; claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al. in view of Gonzalez; and claims 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC

Amendment After Final Rejection  
Serial No. 10/019,297  
Attorney Docket No. 011700

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Burchard et al. in view of Barnard. Each of these rejections has been overcome since the combinations of references fail to teach or suggest the claimed water flow paths noted above.


For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art and defines patentable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicants would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Stephen G. Adrian  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,878  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/arf